

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of July 2, 2008, the drawings were again objected to “because conventional features illustrated in the drawing as rectangular boxes must be labeled for understanding in this application. See 37 CFR 1.83(a).” In addition, claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatenable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0007473 A1 (hereinafter “Strong et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,577,229 (hereinafter “Bonneau et al.”). Furthermore, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatenable over Strong et al. in view of Bonneau et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,610,947 (hereinafter “Balasubramanian et al.”). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatenable over Strong et al. in view of Bonneau et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0024421 A1 (hereinafter “Kang”).

With respect to the drawing objection, Applicants respectfully note that requiring labels to “make the drawings and the claim language easier to, read and understand the applicant’s invention,” as asserted on page 3 of the Office Action, is not valid under PCT Rule 11.11 since making “the drawings and the claim language easier to, read and understand the applicant’s invention” cannot be equated to being “**indispensible** for understanding” (emphasis added), as required under PCT Rule 11.11. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that providing labels in boxes is not required in the current application and request that the drawing objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the claim rejections, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 are not obvious in view of the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-9 and 11-20 be allowed.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 14

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites the limitations of “*the first signal-processing means being configured to code signals using only Miller code and decode signals using only Manchester code for contactless **station-transponder communication***” (emphasis added) and “*the second signal-processing means being configured to code and decode the signals using one of a non-return-to-zero code and an FM zero code for the **contactless station-station communication***” (emphasis added), which are not disclosed in the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited reference of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. disclose various modulation techniques. However, the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. even if combined do not disclose using only Miller code to code signals and using only Manchester code to decode signals “*for contactless station-transponder communication*” and using one of a non-return-to-zero code and an FM zero code to code and decode signals “*for the contactless station-station communication,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Consequently, the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. even if combined fail to disclose the claimed limitations of “*the first signal-processing means being configured to code signals using only Miller code and decode signals using only Manchester code for contactless **station-transponder communication***” (emphasis added) and “*the second signal-processing means being configured to code and decode the signals using one of a non-return-to-zero code and an FM zero code for the **contactless station-station communication***” (emphasis added). Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 5, 9 and 14, which also recite limitations similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claims 5, 9 and 14 are not obvious in view of the cited references of Strong et al. and Bonneau et al. As such, Applicants

respectfully request that the amended independent claims 5, 9 and 14 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-13 and 15-20

Each of the dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-13 and 15-20 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 5, 9 and 14. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kunkat et al.

Date: September 2, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300